DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 372 VT 012 833

TITLE	Employment Contexts and Disadvantaged Workers. Phase 1, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	BSSR-421
PUB DATE	Feb 70
NOTE	69p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Vocational Education, Employer Attitudes, Employment, *Employment Programs, Federal Programs, Job Placement, Research Design, *Research Methodology, Success Factors, *Vocational Followup, *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	WIN, *Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

The first phase of a two-phase study of the employment success of welfare recipients trained and placed under the Work-Incentive (WIN) program is summarized. During this phase the methodology for the study was developed, including questionnaire structure, model field procedures, and study design. Preliminary instruments and procedures were tested in Denver, San Diego, San Bernadino, and Washington, D.C. on the basis of which the questionnaires and research design were revised and retested several times. Although conclusions on such aspects of employment as vocational adjustment and employer attitudes will not be made until Phase II, the field experiences of Phase I did result in considerable data on WIN placements. (BH)

ED049372

BSSR

EMPLOYMENT CONTEXTS AND DISADVANTAGED WORKERS

Phase I - Final Report

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

VT012833

ED049372

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BSSR:421

EMPLOYMENT CONTEXTS AND DISADVANTAGED WORKERS

Phase 1 - Final Report

Prepared for the Manpower Administration,
U. S. Department of Labor

Under Contract # 51-09-69-03

Project Co-Directors: Leonard H. Goodman
Laure M. Sharp

Research Analyst: Jean Ruffin

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

February 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
FIELD VISITS	2
Denver	
Washington, D. C.	
California	
FIELD PROBLEMS	7
Contacting Employers	
Refusals	
Lack of Privacy	
Employer Time Consideration	
Data Collection	
Structured vs. Unstructured Interviews	
Need for More Planning Time in the Local WIN Office	
CONSIDERATIONS FOR REDESIGN OF STUDY	12
Interviewing WIN and Other Employees	
Interviews with Terminated WIN Workers	
Employer Accessibility	
Number of WIN Workers Concerning Whom Information Will Be Obtained	
Number of WIN Employees As Criterion for Selection of Establishments	
Number of Cities	
Interviews with Union Representatives	
Implications for Study Objectives	
SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT WIN PLACEMENTS IN THE FOUR CITIES	19
Scattered Placements	
Low Skill Placements	
The "Hard-Core" Stereotype	
Employer Awareness of WIN Role	
Placements in Public Institutions and Nonprofit Institutions	
Relationship Between Employer-Sponsored WIN Training Programs and Placements	
APPENDIX A	A-1
Establishments Visited for Phase I	
APPENDIX B	B-1
Questionnaire for Employers of WIN Trainees	
Questionnaire for Supervisors	

I. Introduction

This report summarizes the major activities carried out by the BSSR staff during the first phase of a proposed two-phase study designed to investigate the employment situations of welfare recipients trained and placed under the WIN (Work-Incentive) Program. The study design focuses on employer and supervisor attitudes and on organizational accommodations made to integrate such workers into the various employment settings in which they have been placed.

Our major objective during Phase I was to develop and test questionnaires and to set up model field procedures. Other aims were to acquaint ourselves with the WIN program and to explore the feasibility of certain aspects of the study design.

In order to achieve these purposes, we developed preliminary instruments and procedures which were tried out in four cities, namely Denver, Washington, D. C., San Diego, and San Bernardino. The Denver experience is recorded in Progress Report, No. 1, of August 8, 1969, and is briefly recapitulated below. Our field experience in the other three cities is recorded in somewhat more detail in the following pages.

By and large, the above stated purposes were accomplished: the questionnaires were revised four times; the current versions are now undergoing a final pretest in San Francisco; and a number of decisions regarding modifications in research design have been made. These are reviewed in detail in Section IV of this report.

Our purpose in Phase I was thus exclusively methodological; substantive findings in the area which we are investigating--work

adjustment, employer attitudes, types of organizational accommodations, etc.--will have to await the outcome of Phase II where we will conduct a systematic survey with standard instruments and a standard methodology. However, from our field experiences in the four cities, we have learned a good deal about the nature of WIN placements which we took into account in our study design and questionnaire revisions. Some of these observations are briefly summarized in the final section of this report, because we want to give the Manpower Administration, at this time, the benefit of any observations which may be of help in the program area.

II. Field Visits

A. Denver

The first field test took place in Denver between June 23 and 31. The Denver WIN office had made considerable preparatory efforts on our behalf; and one of the Assistant Directors briefed us at length about the operations of the local office when we first arrived. Prior to our arrival, he had prepared a list of employers in the area with two or more WIN employees, and at our request, had set up initial appointments for us with managers or personnel officers in each of these. Since there were only 12 of these employers, we planned to cover them all. We later supplemented the list by adding eight employers from those who had only one WIN employee. Altogether, BSSR staff members visited a total of 20 organizations, which employed among them (or were still employing) approximately 60 WIN "graduates." Included were several employers who had had considerable experience with WIN training (work experience) programs including a large hospital (the University of Colorado Medical Center) and Denver Opportunity (the local Community Action roof agency).

In each establishment, we sought interviews with one high level management representative and all those supervisors who supervised WIN employees (at the lowest level). We interviewed, as well, whenever feasible, one or two WIN workers in each organization.[1]

B. Washington, D. C.

We had orginally planned to include at least one site on the East Coast for one of our three major field tests, but because of a number of difficulties in obtaining clearances from the State Employment Service or local WIN offices, the sites chosen turned out to be unfeasible.[2] We therefore decided on a small pretest in Washington, D. C.; and the new versions of our questionnaires, developed after the Denver trip, were tested in the Washington area during August by several members of the BSSR staff. In Washington, we interviewed personnel managers and supervisors only; our evaluation of the Denver experience led us to decide not to interview any of the WIN workers themselves. Employers interviewed included one local and one federal government facility (D. C. Village and the Federal Power Commission), one hospital (Georgetown Hospital), and two small private businesses (a computer management firm and a printing company; both firms were doing mostly work under government contracts). We collected data on some 23 WIN workers (16 women and 7 men) most of whom had been on the job between three and ten months. Typical jobs were those of bindery worker, food service worker, and key puncher.

---

[1]For a more detailed description of the Denver field test see Employment Contexts and Disadvantaged Workers Progress Report No. 1, BSSR, August 18, 1969.

[2]See BSSR memorandum to Manpower Administration, dated September 17, 1969, "Negotiations with WIN and Employment Service Representatives."

In a number of ways, Washington, with the Federal Government as chief direct and indirect employer, is a special situation.

Much of the training given by WIN is geared to clerical employment in the government, which most WIN clients prefer because of the relatively higher wages and security afforded, and this is where the bulk of the placements are. It is also our impression that there were far fewer self-placements in Washington than in the other cities studied. The typical case is that of an AFDC mother whose only employment in the past has been as a domestic worker. She is given institutional training in clerical work, provided by WIN, and obtains work in a federal agency at the G.S. 1 or G.S. 2 level. A second method of qualifying a WIN enrollee for civil service employment is to place her with a government agency for work experience, after six months of which she is eligible to apply for a G.S. rating.

Thus it became necessary to adapt our questionnaires to these civil service situations.

However, although the complications on the federal level in Washington are perhaps somewhat greater, this pattern of placements in government agencies, including state and local, or quasi-government organizations (such as hospitals or other large bureaucratic, nonprofit institutions) is frequently encountered elsewhere. This is in part because legislation usually limited initial training to such agencies; there is much subsequent hiring from the training programs.

C. California

The California field tests took place in San Diego from November 10 to 14 and San Bernardino from November 17 to 21 and were carried out

by members of the BSSR staff and two professional interviewers from a West Coast survey organization.

On our arrival in each of the California cities, we had a general meeting of our study staff with the Employment Service Director and members of the WIN staff, during which we described the purposes of our study while they in turn provided us with some background information on the local operation of the program.

We had contacted each local office about a week before our arrival requesting that lists be prepared of those employers in the area with two or more WIN employees. There were 17 of these in San Diego and 27 in San Bernardino. From these lists, we chose somewhat smaller samples but later added a few employers, chosen on a random basis, who had only one WIN employee. Our final lists comprised over 20 employers in each city. Names and job titles of WIN workers with the selected employers were supplied by the local office; and we then used WIN office records to obtain some additional information on each WIN enrollee, such as age, sex, ethnic group, etc.

In San Diego, as in Denver, the WIN office not only made initial contacts with the employers, but also set up appointments for us with management representatives of each organization. In San Bernardino, however, after some initial appointments had been set up in advance by the WIN office, and introductory calls made to the other employers, we called employers ourselves in order to arrange appointments.

Altogether in San Diego, we visited 19 different places of employment, eight with two or more WIN employees. Among the employers, there was a higher proportion of industries as opposed to public agencies

than in Denver, a number of them being electronics or aerospace firms. There were six such firms, several small businesses, including a department store, a garage, and two hotels, and a few small nonprofit associations and state or local government agencies. These organizations had hired among them at least 70 WIN graduates (7 men and 63 women). Some 41 of these had jobs as electronic assemblers or aircraft assemblers. Of the 70 on the original list, 60 were still on the job at the time of our visit, two had been fired, and eight others had left, most from the electronic assembler jobs.

In San Bernardino, the number of employers visited was also 19, 14 of whom had more than one WIN employee, although the placements here were more scattered than in San Diego, with very little concentration with any one employer. The pattern for the majority of cases, where there was more than one, was two per employer. Employers included a large steel mill, two large retail stores, two large hospitals, as well as six public agencies, and several small businesses. Some of the employers were in the surrounding area, rather than in San Bernardino itself--one in Ontario, one in Cucumonga (both some 20 miles away) one in Fontana, and one in Redlands. There were 43 WIN workers employed by these organizations (12 men and 31 women), mostly in clerical or service jobs; 36 were still on the job at the time of our visit.

As in Denver and Washington, Interviews were conducted with employers or employer representatives, usually personnel managers, and with the immediate supervisors of the WIN employees. We began by again trying to cover all supervisors in each organization who had supervised WIN workers, but later reduced the number of supervisors to be interviewed

to one per establishment (see discussion of study design below). We adhered to our decision, reached after the Denver test, not to interview WIN workers themselves.

A complete listing of employers in the four cities interviewed for Phase I will be found in Appendix A.

III. Field Problems

In the course of our field work, various problems became apparent.

A. Contacting Employers

As noted above, in Denver and San Diego, appointments with employers were set up for us by the WIN office. This procedure, however, was not very satisfactory for a number of reasons. After our experiences in these two cities, it seemed essential to explain in advance and in some detail our study objectives to the employers in order to prepare them for the requirements of our interviews and obtain their cooperation. This could, of course, be done only by someone closely associated with the project. It still seemed advisable, on the other hand, to have the WIN office make an initial contact with each employer. It was for this reason that we changed our procedure in San Bernardino, making appointments ourselves after an introductory telephone call had been made by the WIN office. This second approach, although more time-consuming, worked considerably better. We are now working out the details of the more formal procedure (including preliminary letters to employers, to be sent with a covering letter from the WIN office, letters of introduction for interviewers, etc.) which will be necessary in a national survey where interviews will be carried out by others than members of our own staff.

B. Refusals

Most employers were interested in the survey and glad to have their opinions asked. We did encounter a problem, however, in San Diego with some of the aerospace and electronics firms. Here, in several cases, interviewing the supervisors of the WIN worker was made difficult or impossible by the personnel managers, possibly, in part, because of security reasons. We hope that this difficulty can be eliminated by greater advance preparation with employers.

C. Lack of Privacy

We experienced some difficulties, particularly in our earlier interviews in talking with each respondent privately, for the management representative would frequently call in a supervisor to answer questions or try to remain present during an interview with a supervisor. Although we found there were some advantages in certain situations to group interviews, it was decided that other considerations made private interviews essential. This problem can be fairly easily handled simply by explaining in advance the need for privacy, as one of the conditions of our study. This is another instance where more advance preparation with employers will be of value.

D. Employer Time Consideration

Initially, we attempted to collect fairly detailed information on the total number of WIN employees in each establishment, information on each type of job held by a WIN graduate, the characteristics of each unit in which a WIN worker had been placed, as well as supervisor impressions in regard to all of his WIN workers or each one separately.

We found, however, that this took an inordinate amount of time with each employer, requiring as much as two hours for some interviews.

This was especially awkward in the case of supervisors who often find it impossible to be away for long from the production line. Our respondents were usually glad to cooperate but unwilling to give such a large amount of time. In the interests of feasibility, therefore, it has been decided to bring the time required of any one employer within reasonable limits, by sacrificing some of this detail. The planned changes are discussed below (see Section IV).

E. Data Collection

Before we initiated our field tests, we were uncertain about the kinds of information which might be obtained from official records, through the local WIN program officer, from employers and supervisors, and from the WIN trainees themselves. These questions have been settled as a result of the pretest experience.

The WIN office records on the trainees, their status and personal characteristics are usually accessible and reasonably accurate, at least for our purposes. Not infrequently we discovered discrepancies between WIN and employer records as to the employment status of individuals. The discrepancies were attributable in most cases to normal delays in the updating of records, a common problem in view of self-placement by some trainees, and the rapid changes in the situations of other WIN workers who sometimes leave a job after only a brief period.

Although the information is usually available, it is not always simple to compile it in the form required for the purpose of this study, i.e., a complete listing of all WIN placements with a single employer.

This was in part due to the way WIN office records are set up--by individual enrollees rather than by employer, with separate records for each WIN team. Also, in the course of the development of the programs, records have changed from time to time and are not always uniform either in form or amount of data given. Obtaining information from the records, however, was far easier in San Diego and San Bernardino than it had been in Washington, D. C. because of the number of teams was much fewer--only two or three in each city as opposed to eight in Washington.

We have in general supplemented information received from the WIN office by that given by the employer. Again, it has not always been easy to obtain accurate information or even exact lists of WIN employees from the employer without causing long delays, while data is sought in various records. Such delays tend to jeopardize the interview, wasting precious time and good will. More accurate information could only be obtained by taking more of the employer's time and by checking back with the WIN office and trying to reconcile differences. Even with this extra effort, however, it is unlikely that we would be able to get wholly accurate information in every case.

These difficulties have now been, to some degree, obviated by our decision to limit the range of our inquiry on individuals (and their backgrounds) and to limit our detailed inquiries from employers to one individual per establishment. (See discussion below.)

F. Structured vs. Unstructured Interviews

After the Denver and Washington field tests, it became apparent that it would be extremely difficult to fit a structured questionnaire to the variety of situations encountered among large and small organizations,

public and private agencies, those employers who conducted WIN training programs and those who had never heard of WIN, etc. Thus it was decided to experiment with a more flexible method of data collection. Before the California field test, we compiled data sheets including all information desired which we expected the interviewers to collect by whatever means turned out to be most convenient, either by using interview guides as we had prepared them or changing the order of questions and by obtaining information from whatever source could supply the needed information. It quickly became apparent, however, that it would be difficult to have interviewers operate outside the more conventional structured questionnaire, and it was concluded that, for the large scale national survey, the structured questionnaire would be the only feasible means of collecting information of the kind desired. We will need to spend considerable time on interviewer briefing and training, however, and will need to recruit very high-caliber interviewers who have the ability to make adjustments in their interviewing approaches.

G. Need for More Planning Time in the Local WIN Office

We found it extremely difficult to accomplish the various preliminary tasks in connection with each field visit in the time which we had allotted. In order to make the selection of employers, contact each one in the proper manner, obtain background information on the operation of the local program from Employment Service and WIN representatives, and collect data on individual WIN enrollees, considerably more planning time will be required in each local office than we had originally envisioned. Probably an advance visit to each city of at least several days or a week on the part of one of our staff members should be scheduled.

Since the work would mostly be done by our own staff, however, we do not foresee increasing the demands on the time of the WIN staff.

IV. Considerations for Redesign of Study

Apart from the development and testing of instruments, the main purpose of the work conducted under Phase I was to explore the feasibility of certain aspects of the original study design. Now, as a result of the field experience in the four cities, most of the questions have been settled and various aspects of the design correspondingly revised. A summary of the revised design is included in the proposal for Phase II which is being submitted separately; this section of the present report deals with the rationale for each of the major modifications.

A. Interviewing WIN and Other Employees

The original proposal tentatively suggested the possibility of collecting certain data from WIN workers and other employees engaged in similar work by means of group interviews, first, and then by means of self-administered questionnaires. This was to be done at the work sites and "on employers' time." However, the idea proved to be entirely unfeasible; this conclusion was reached almost at the outset of the work in Denver. It became abundantly clear, first, that in a very large proportion of establishments managers would be extremely reluctant to release people for this purpose--even for 15 or 20 minutes. Second, there was the not uncommon fear among employers that the former welfare status of the WIN workers would somehow be revealed if they were interviewed in any way. In the process of interviewing several WIN employees, we also discovered that they too could be extremely apprehensive on the same score.

The decision was therefore made at that time that these risks, together with the liklihood of frequent refusal of cooperation on the part of employers, indicated that this feature of the design should be abandoned.

B. Interviews with Terminated WIN Workers

At the same time, however, we believed that the study would be less than complete without some data obtained directly from WIN trainees--even though they are not the main focus of the investigation. We have therefore decided to expand the study to include interviews with a number of WIN workers who have terminated their employment with the organization selected for inclusion in the study--insofar as possible, one former employee for each establishment. The principal object of these interviews would be to discover what difficulties these individuals may have experienced in adjusting to the employment context, their views on the extent to which the establishment attempted to accommodate their needs and special circumstances, their reasons for leaving and their opinions regarding their participation in the WIN program.

C. Employer Accessibility

One of the important reservations about the feasibility of this study at the outset had to do with the prospect of cooperation from the establishments which employ WIN trainees, particularly private commercial and industrial firms. By and large, the apprehension on this score turned out to be unwarranted: an overwhelming majority of the employers contacted in Denver, San Diego, and San Bernardino were more than willing to be interviewed, to permit supervisors to be interviewed and to give the required amounts of time and information. There were several instances in which interviews could not be conveniently arranged during the pretest

period, but they might have been conducted had the period been extended. In a few instances, cooperation was somewhat less than desirable, but for understandable reasons, e.g., a desire to prevent a supervisor from associating a worker with welfare, plant security restrictions, lack of time, etc. Of all the places of employment contacted, only one refused cooperation. Further, it is very likely that the few difficulties encountered could have been avoided or mitigated by means of written communication further in advance; this will be incorporated into the field procedures during the second phase of the study.

However, we have also discovered that the degree of cooperation even among the most hospitable employers is not unlimited. In most instances, we can probably count on about an hour's time with the owner or personnel manager and certainly no more than this with the WIN employee's supervisor. This means, first, that the questionnaires must be kept fairly short and that the <u>average</u> interviewing time be kept under an hour. Second, the time constraint reduces the <u>number</u> of people we can expect to interview. Whereas the original plan was to interview several persons in each establishment, we are now convinced that this should be restricted to two, the front office manager and one supervisor. If this number were increased the number of refusals would be unacceptably high. Furthermore, we have found that multiple interviews within the same establishment tend to become repetitious and therefore less valuable.

D. <u>Number of WIN Workers Concerning Whom Information Will Be Obtained</u>

Having made the foregoing decision, the number of WIN workers on whom we will gather information at the work site is automatically restricted:

it would be the largest number in any single supervisor's unit. However, another consideration enters in. The various attempts to collect data concerning more than one WIN employee, whether from owners, personnel officers or supervisors, were notably unsuccessful, and, of course, the larger the number the more conspicious the failure. This owed partly to the fact that certain kinds of information were often either unavailable or difficult to retrieve, partly to the fact that obtaining it, when it was available, took inordinate amounts of time. Accordingly, another approach was indicated, and one was gradually evolved and tested in San Bernardino. The decision was to restrict the inquiry to a single WIN employee and to ensure against bias in the choice of this one individual by selecting his name in advance on a random basis wherever two or more were employed in the same establishment. This means that the sampling procedure is extended another step and that there will be a sample of WIN employees (and, by the same token, of supervisors) as large and perhaps as representative as the sample of establishments. (It should be recalled at this point that the unit of analysis and the sampling unit in this study is the organization, not the WIN employee.)

While this restricts the number of WIN workers concerning whom <u>detailed</u> information is to be obtained, it does not affect the recording of basic data on the other WIN workers employed in the same establishments. For each WIN employee in each work site selected we would continue to record: from WIN office records, such items as age, sex, level of education, number of dependents, occupation, placement dates, beginning wage, whether formerly a trainee in the organization, etc.; and from the employer's records we would ascertain employment status, length of time with the organization, and, if no longer there, reason for leaving or beir

E. Number of WIN Employees As Criterion for Selection of Establishments

One of the assumptions implicit from the outset in decisions regarding the choice of locales for the study--whether communities or work sites--was that there ought to be some minimal number of WIN placements. The field work experience to date indicates very clearly that even in fairly large cities the number of WIN placements is relatively small, and that the number placed even in giant industrial plants is correspondingly small. We would venture to guess that the average number of placements, at any given time, per establishment does not exceed two. If this, then, is the magnitude of the placement figures, it may be argued that it should be reflected in this study. We have, therefore gradually modified our selection procedures and criteria vis-à-vis establishments. Whereas in Denver we stipulated at first that each establishment included should employ at least five WIN trainees, we soon reduced this to two. By the time the work in San Diego was completed, we had decided on the necessity of including at least a few places employing only one WIN worker. And before leaving San Bernardino, we were convinced that all establishments should be represented, regardless of the number of placements. At this point it appeared that the most sensible approach was to stratify all employer organizations by number of WIN employees and then to make a random selection within each size class. This is the procedure we now advocate for Phase II. It would assure the proportional inclusion of organizations which are characteristic in terms of the numbers of WIN workers they employ.

F. Number of Cities

The original design stipulated that 30 communities--representing the several geographic regions of the county as well as urban and rural areas--would be included in the study, and that an average of four places of employment would be selected within each, yielding a total sample of 120 employers. We have now reduced the number of cities to 15, with a larger number of employers (20) to be sampled in each city. Our first consideration in making this change is the total scope of WIN activities in various cities and states: because of the extremely small number of placements in some areas, they must be ruled out as sites, thus leaving us with a more limited number of sites to choose from. Our second consideration is rooted in the decision to increase the amount of advance preparation in each city. It therefore seemed more practical as well as more economical to reduce the number of places visited and increase the number of employers in each.

G. Interviews with Union Representatives

In the 130 or so interviews conducted with 65 employers in the four Phase I locations, we have attempted to explore the role of union rules and membership in the recruitment, retention, and promotion of WIN workers. Because of the types of placements made--either low-skill and low-level, or at higher levels involving only a very few individuals in a given establishment--we have not found this to be a significant issue deserving of separate interviews with union personnel. In only one case--a large employer in California--did we have an indication that union opposition made it impossible to extend the probation period of a WIN worker, thereby leading to dismissal. We will continue to explore the issue through our interviews with personnel officers, supervisors, and terminated

WIN workers; if we find a number of situations where the union issue is salient, we will consider obtaining supplementary data from union representatives.

H. Implications for Study Objectives

The goals and objectives of the study are not affected by these design changes. The basic questions to which the study addresses itself can be answered with the material we now propose to gather from cross-sections of employers, supervisors and terminated WIN workers:

1. Do WIN employees encounter unique problems in adjusting to jobs after placement, or do they merely experience the kinds of routine problems shared by most new employees?

2. To what extent have employers made special provisions to facilitate the integration of WIN employees, and to what extent have such provisions been effective?

3. Who are the "significant others" in the work context whose attitudes and behavior are of crucial importance in the accommodation of WIN employees. For example, are supervisors more important than coworkers?

4. To what extent are the problems of adjustment, on the part of both managers and workers, related to characteristics of the work context?

However, it is clear from the field work we have done so far that there are several other elements in the work context which affect the recruitment, retention, and successful integration of WIN (and other disadvantaged) workers and which we will need to consider in Phase II. Some of these are mentioned in the final section of this report. Most prominent among these, we feel, is the extent to which civil service and quasi-civil service regulations are interpreted or adjusted and the extent to which

employers--profit making as well as nonprofit institutions--become involved in WIN-sponsored training programs, and perceive them as useful from the point of view of their own organizational needs.

V. Some Observations About WIN Placements in the Four Cities

When we initiated the field work for Phase I, we had made several tacit assumptions about situations and problems which might affect WIN placements. Our initial proposal focussed on the possibility that large numbers of persons with a background of welfare dependency would be placed in work settings where there was the likelihood of antagonism to "welfare recipients." We also foresaw the need for some adaptation on the part of employers to accommodate the subcultural characteristics of the disadvantaged, large numbers of whom were to be absorbed in work contexts characterized by policies, workers and values with which the new workers were unfamiliar.

To a large extent, these assumptions have been borne out by our field experiences to date. However, the pattern is far from uniform. Given the placement record to date, we feel that the total picture is quite complex and does not fit the rather simplistic model under which we started to operate. As a result of our observations, we have expanded the scope of our design and questionnaire to accommodate this greater diversity of situations.

A. Scattered Placements

Our original assumption that fairly sizable number of WIN workers would be hired in one place of employment has not been borne out. Instead of the five or ten or more WIN workers per establishment we had expected,

we have found one or two WIN workers per employer--for example, two workers in a company manufacturing truck parts, three at a local health center, one at a beauty shop, one at a sporting goods store. Furthermore, in places where there have been larger numbers of placements, they are likely to be scattered throughout the organization: in a hospital there will be one or two in the food service department, one working as a nurse's aide, one in the maintenance department, etc.

Placements in general were far fewer in number than we had anticipated. When we first observed this in Denver, where referrals from the Welfare Department had been slow in coming (only one or two per day in the spring and summer months instead of the ten the office was prepared to handle), we thought that we were dealing with an exceptional situation. But in the two California cities, where there had been such a flood of referrals that enrollments had been frozen in June in order to deal with the backlog, the actual proportion of placements in relation to total WIN enrollments--as judged from number of persons in follow-up status--is not much higher.

It is not our objective to study the dynamics of WIN operations and the reasons for low placement levels. From the point of view of our study, the consequence was relatively low visibility of WIN programs and WIN workers within employment settings. The presence of a single ex-welfare employee is obviously a different social problem from a "mass input" of, say, 10 such workers into a unit with 30 employees. This is not to say that there are no adjustment problems for the worker or for the employer. Obviously, they exist regardless of the numbers involved. It merely means that at times the focus of the inquiry becomes more individualized than we had anticipated.

B. Low Skill Placements

Implicit in our assumption about conflicting norms and values between WIN workers and their employers or supervisors was the notion that WIN placements would emphasize training and upgrading, shunning low-skill and low-wage placements. However, many placements to date have been in jobs for which a minimum amount of prior training is required, where very few social or work skills are needed, and where there is a good deal of leniency about rules and attendance, usually because the jobs are undesirable, poorly paid, and often hard to fill except by recruiting disadvantaged or "hard-core" applicants. In a number of cases, WIN workers were placed in departments or organizations which traditionally hired workers from the "disadvantaged" group (the city building maintenance department in Denver) or with organizations, for instance, a community health organization, where there is a built-in requirement to hire workers for certain jobs from the surrounding community. In such circumstances, WIN workers were indistinguishable from the regular workforce, and there was no stigma attached to being a welfare recipient. In fact, in a few instances, employers found their "pre-screened" WIN workers to be superior to the employees they had recruited through other channels.

C. The "Hard-Core" Stereotype

It is important to emphasize that not all placements were in such low-skill occupations. In some instances, the program operated as an upgrading agent, training relatively unskilled individuals and placing them in desirable jobs. But in other cases, the better placements occurred because welfare recipients were not members of the hard-core sector, but were men or women with a fair amount of education or work experience who

had become temporarily dependent on welfare because of illness, childbirth, etc. WIN performed a valuable function in helping them toward employment and self-support; within the work context, these individuals were not perceived as essentially "different" from the regular work force, although they too--because of special problems--may make it necessary for employers to make special adjustments.

D. Employer Awareness of WIN Role

In designing our study and planning our employer interviews, we had tacitly assumed that employers whose names were given to us by the local WIN office would obviously be aware of the role WIN had played in training and/or referring one or more workers. This too turned out to be an over-simplification. On the one hand, even employers and supervisors who had been in contact with WIN often lump WIN workers together with those who came from other manpower programs--CEP, NYC, JOBS, etc. This is generally true except for the employers who have training contracts with WIN. In the second place, there are a fair number of self-placements. In such cases, the WIN office has knowledge of the workers' place of employment through WIN follow-up activities, but the employer is often unaware of the role WIN played in relation to a self-placed employee.

Welfare recipients with previous experience or fair amounts of education are more likely than hard-core welfare cases to find jobs on their own, but there were a considerable number of self-placements at all levels. A former cook at Sages, a department store in San Bernardino, merely returned to her old place of employment. One WIN enrollee found herself a job in Denver as a telephone operator at the Rocky Mountain Telephone Company. She had formerly worked for the Bell Telephone Company

in New York and was classified in the personnel records as a "transfer and reinstatement."

E. Placements in Public Institutions and Nonprofit Institutions

Because initially WIN training contracts were set up with nonprofit institutions such as hospitals or with various government agencies--federal, state, or local, there have been a number of placements in these areas, when former trainees were taken on as regular employees.[1] The number of placements in public agencies lends increased significance to a factor to which we did not originally give great weight--civil service regulations. These have important implications, especially for the hiring picture, where they can be a barrier even at the lowest level.

In some instances, regulations have been bent. For instance, in a city maintenance department, the eighth grade education and six months experience requirements for the janitor job were waived for WIN trainees. But, in other instances civil service regulations were fairly rigid. In one of the California cities a state agency had trained a WIN enrollee for about a year, then taken her on as a temporary employee. She was able to do the job, and her supervisor was anxious to keep her, but was unable to do so because of her inability to pass a civil service test. There were other situations where agencies were unable to hire WIN trainees even when they passed the test because they placed too low on the civil service register.

---

[1]One effect of the number of training programs and placements by all manpower programs in public agencies, is that these agencies have been saturated with trainees. It was reported, for instance, that one in ten of the 5,000 regular city employees in Denver is a trainee or recent hiree from one of these manpower programs. This is said to put an inordinate strain on supervisory personnel, a situation deserving of further investigation in Phase II of our study.

In still other situations, civil service rules can be manipulated to accommodate disadvantaged workers. For example, a particular job was downgraded--from GS 3 to GS 1 or GS 2 so that a former WIN trainee could fill it, with the provision that it would be upgraded again when the particular employee had improved in performance. These manipulations may please supervisors who need to squeeze their budget, but their effect on the WIN worker and his co-workers needs to be looked at more closely in our future field studies.

Civil service regulations may inhibit the recruitment or promotion of WIN workers in other ways. Since once a person is hired as regular employee, it is difficult or for practical purposes, often impossible to fire him, the probation period takes on great importance. These periods are often not long enough for an employer to make a decision; thus he may feel it too risky to keep the person, even when his inclination would be to give him or her another chance. Employer accommodations thus may take the form of longer probation periods or the setting up of temporary jobs. The latter procedure deprives the WIN worker of the very benefits he associates with civil service jobs: tenure, automatic pay increases, and fringe benefits such as annual and sick leave. We feel that we need to devote considerable attention in our Phase II research to the complex problem experienced by WIN workers and their employers in civil service settings.

F. Relationship Between Employer-Sponsored WIN Training Programs and Placements

This is another area where the field work alerted us to the presence of a factor affecting placements of which we had not been fully aware: carry-over from trainee positions to regular (employer-paid) employment.

In the cities we studied, employer motivations in sponsoring WIN trainees varied a great deal. Broadly speaking, there were probably two main orientations:

1. Some employers used the training programs as an inexpensive means of training and screening future employees, especially for jobs which are hard to fill. Hospital training slots often fall into this category.

2. Other employers see the training program as being part of their community service function or use it as a source of inexpensive temporary labor; WIN clients are trained primarily for placement in other organizations. Training in community agencies and some civil service situations fall into this category.

At the time of Phase I field work, most training programs were still in the public or nonprofit sector; during Phase II, we expect to find more work-training under industry sponsorship.

At times, training programs are not conducted in the employer's own plant, but they are nevertheless designed to train and pre-select employees for specific openings. In San Diego, the WIN program set up a course for electronic assemblers, where the instructor came from a company which subsequently hired many of these enrollees. This course may also have served a kind of screening function, weeding out those who did not have the patience or aptitude for the work. Such arrangements may turn up more often during Phase II.

The existence of a training program--and placement as the outcome of work training--is obviously an important factor to be considered in our study. During the training period, many of the mutual adjustments which are required on the part of the worker and the employer may be worked out.

Perhaps more important, the training period may become a screening period, and those trainees who become regular employees have thus been selected as being exceptionally "problem-free" from the perspective of the employer. Thus, in comparing various employment contexts, we need to be aware of the training dimension as one more important contextual variable.

APPENDIX A

Establishments Visited for Phase I

Denver

Denver Department of Welfare
Denver Opportunity (local community action roof agency)
Timpte, Inc. (manufacturer of truck parts)
Denver City and County Building, Maintenance Department
University of Colorado Medical Center
Denver Zoological Garden, City Park
City and County Parks and Recreation Department
City and County of Denver Sanitation Department
Emily Griffith Opportunity School (part of the Denver Public School system)
East Side Health Center
West Side Health Center
Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Company
Paxton Lumber Company
Brentwood Beauty Salon
*Mountain Empire Dairyman's Association
Drs. Manly, Foust, Hardy and Henry (private medical clinic)
Panel Corporation of America
General Rose Memorial Hospital
Capital Chevrolet (garage)
Colorado Outdoor Sports (manufacturers of skiing and camping equipment)

Washington, D. C.

Federal Power Commission
D. C. Village, Food Service Department
Darsel Graphic Art Service Inc.
Computer Management and Services Corp.
Georgetown Hospital

San Bernardino

Interagency Board of U. S. Civil Service Examiners
County Clerk of San Bernardino, County Clerk's Office
California State Department of Human Resources Development
Ontario Department of Welfare (Ontario, California)
San Bernardino Public Library
San Bernardino Valley Junior College, Food Service Department
Norton Air Force Base, Southern Area Support Center

---

*Telephone interview only.

San Bernardino County Hospital
Patton Hospital (state mental hospital)
Kaiser Steel Corp., Steel Manufacturing Division (Fontana, California)
Sears Roebuck and Company
Sage's Department Store
Bank of America
May Company (department store)
Home Pool Equipment
Colton Sportsware Manufacturing Company
Fairco Company (supplier of laundry equipment)
Abitibi Paneling Company (Cucamonga, California)
Stevens Hosiery, Division of J. P. Stevens and Company, Inc. (Redlands, California)

San Diego

General Dynamics Corp., Electronics Division
General Dynamics Corp., Convair Division
Union Carbide Corp.
Digital Development Corp.
Honeywell Inc., Communications and Data Products Division
Singer General Precision Inc., Kearfott Division (San Marcos, California)
University Hospital of San Diego County
Sheltered Workshop, Inc.
California State Department of Human Resources Development, Youth Opportunity Center
Community Convalescent Hospital of La Mesa (La Mesa, California)
Knollwood Convalescent Home
Retarded Children's Association of San Diego, Youth Activity Center
San Diego County Heart Association
Buffums Department Store
Bahia Hotel
Del Coronado Hotel
Community Action Council
King's Club (nightclub)
Rudy's Garage

APPENDIX B

WIN STUDY--BSSR 421 (FACE SHEET) Interviewer_____ Date_____ Time_____

Organization_____ Phone No._____

Address_____
(Street) (City)

Initial Contact_____ Respondant_____

Title_____ Title_____

Type of establishment (one or two descriptive words)_____

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX OR BOXES:

- ☐ Government: ☐ federal ☐ state ☐ city or county
- ☐ Private business: ☐ manufacturing ☐ nonmanufacturing
- ☐ Nonprofit
- ☐ Professional firm
- ☐ Other (specify)_____

Employer operates a training program for WIN (or has had WIN workers as trainees for "work-experience" or OJT)?

☐ No ☐ Yes, in the past only ☐ Yes, currently

IF YES: Type of program:_____ Dates_____ No. Enrolled Now_____

Supervisor to be interviewed_____ Unit_____

(1) WIN worker_____

(2) Alternate_____

(3) Alternate_____

(Check name of WIN worker whose supervisor is actually to be interviewed.)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EMPLOYERS OF WIN TRAINEES

Name of Organization: _____

Suggested Introduction

As we explained in our letter and over the phone, we are interested in talking about the worker(s) from the WIN program hired by your organization. We will want to talk primarily about one WIN worker, _____, whose name we picked at random from the files at the WIN office and then talk to her supervisor (that is her most direct supervisor at the lowest level).

Now I would like to ask you some general questions about your organization (business) (plant) and then something about your own experience with the WIN employee(s).

1A. First of all, I would like to ask a few general questions about your (organization) (company) (business).

Is this the only location of this organization or are there others, either in this (metropolitan area) (county) or elsewhere?

Only one location (ASK B). 1

Other locations in metropolitan area (ASK B & C) 2

Other locations inside and outside of metropolitan area (ASK B & C) . . 3

Other locations, but only outside of metropolitan area (ASK B) 4

B. How many employees do you have (here) (in this location)?

_____

C. How many employees are there in this metropolitan area?

_____

2. How long has this (organization) (branch) (location) been in operation?

Under 1 year. 1

1 - under 3 years 2

3 - 5 years 3

6 - 10 years. 4

11 - 20 years 5

Over 20 years 6

3. ASK IF NECESSARY OR FILL IN FROM OBSERVATION: What is the principal activity of this organization? (Chief product, service performed, etc.)

4A. IF PRIVATE OR COMMERCIAL FIRM: Has your organization ever done any work under contract with the federal government?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 5). 2

B. Do you presently have any contracts with the federal government?

Yes (ASK C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 5). 2

C. What percent of your business is with the federal government at the present time?

Less than 25%. 1

25 to 50%. 2

51 to 75%. 3

More than 75%. 4

5. About what percentage of all your hourly wage workers are men?

Less than 25%. 1

25 to 50%. 2

51 to 75%. 3

Over 75% 4

Don't know 5

6. Next, I have a few questions about fringe benefits and other policies that apply to hourly wage earners here. The ones we are especially interested in are listed on this card. (HAND R CARD A.) I'd also like to know whether _____ (NAME OF WIN WORKER) is entitled to any of them?

A. First of all, how many paid holidays are there per year? _____

_____ days?

B. Does _____ get paid for these holidays?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 7) 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not? _____

_____

7A. And how many days of paid vacation are there? None _____.

_____ days after _____ months of service.

_____ days after _____ years of service.

_____ days after _____ years of service.

B. Is _____ under this leave system?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 8) 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why is that?

8A. Is there paid sick leave?

Yes (ASK B, C & D). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 9) 2

B. How many days per month?

_____ days per month.

C. How long after being hired can you first take sick leave?

_____ months

D. Does this apply to _____?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 9) 1

No (ASK D) 2

E. Why not?

9A. Is there employer-paid hospital insurance?

Yes (ASK A). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 10) 2

B. Is _____ eligible for this?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 10). 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not?

10A. Is there an employer paid pension plan?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 11) 2

B. Is _____ eligible for this?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 11). 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not?

11A. Is there employer-paid life insurance?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 12) 2

B. Is _____ entitled to this?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 12). 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not?

12A. Is there profit sharing?

Yes (ASK B) 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 13). 2

B. Does this policy apply to _____?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 13). 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not?

13A. Are there discounts?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 14) 2

B. Does this policy apply to _____?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 14). 1

No (ASK C) 2

C. Why not?

14A. Are there any <u>other</u> fringe benefits?

Yes (ASK B & C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 15) 2

B. What are they?

C. Do these policies apply to _____?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 15). 1

No (ASK D) 2

D. Why not?

15A. Is there usually a probation period for new hourly wage workers?

Yes (ASK B & C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 16) 2

B. How long does it last? _____

C. What is _____'s status with regard to probation?

On probation 1

Completed probation. 2

Was never on 3

16A. Are pay raises automatic for these workers?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 17) 2

B. How often are these raises given, on the average--every six months, once a year, or less often?

Every six months or less. 1

About once a year 2

Less often. 3

17. Is there an employee's handbook that gives information about the kinds of things we've just been talking about?

Yes (REQUEST COPY) 1

No 2

18A. Do the employees in this (organization) (company) belong to any unions--that is, unions which have a fairly large membership?

Yes (ASK B & C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 19) 2

B. Can you give a rough idea of how many people would be eligible to belong to each and how many actually belong?

Union	Number Eligible	Number Who Belong	Contracts Yes	Contracts No
_____	_____	_____	1	2
_____	_____	_____	1	2
_____	_____	_____	1	2
_____	_____	_____	1	2

C. Does this organization have contracts with any of these?

Yes (ASK D). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 19) 2

D. Which ones? (CIRCLE YES OR NO ABOVE)

19A. Has your organization ever hired any disadvantaged workers who came through other employment programs besides WIN, such as JOBS or New Careers? (MENTION OTHER LOCAL PROGRAMS.)

Yes (ASK B & C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 20) 2

B. Which programs were they? (LIST BELOW.)

	Training		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3

C. Did your organization carry on any training programs under contract in connection with (this program) (any of these programs)? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER ABOVE.)

20A. And now I would like to ask you a few questions about the WIN program.

IF ORGANIZATION HAS NOT CONDUCTED TRAINING FOR WIN, SKIP TO Q. 22.

IF ORGANIZATION HAS HAD WIN TRAINEES, ASK:

I understand that your organization has conducted some kind of training on behalf of the WIN program. Was this OJT, work experience, or some other kind of training?

OJT (ASK B-F). 1

Work experience (ASK B-F). . 2

Other (specify):_____

_____(ASK B-F). . 3

Don't know (SKIP TO Q. 22) . 4

20B. What kinds of jobs were the trainees being prepared for?

C. How many people have been in training (OJT, work experience, etc.) altogether?

D. Of all the people that have been here as WIN "trainees," how many have actually been hired?

E. Can you think in what way having (a WIN training program) (WIN trainees) is useful to your organization?

F. Can you think of any disadvantages?

21. Here are some of the comments about these different training programs which we have received from other employers. I would like to know if any of them apply here. (HAND R CARD B.)

	Yes	No.
1. Some companies use the program mainly to train workers all of whom they plan to absorb in their company. Is this the case here?	1	2
2. Other companies say that what they like about the program is that it gives them a chance to test a group of prospective employees, i.e., gives a chance to look them over and hire the best. Do you do this?	1	2
3. Others think the advantage of the program is that it helps them fill manpower needs at no expense while at the same time these people are doing something useful or being trained for work elsewhere. Is this true in your case? .	1	2
4. Still others like having an arrangement under which they have trained persons available when job openings occur; in other words, with the help of the program, you can hold people whom you want to take on but for whom you don't have an opening or money in the budget until a little later. Is this the case here?.	1	2

22A. Now I would like to go over my records with you. These are the names of the WIN employees we got from the WIN office. I want to make sure that the list is complete, and I would also like to know a little more about each of these people.

WIN employees hired by organization;

Name	Type of Job	Highest Grade Completed	Nationality or Race W,N,S,O	Sex	Age	No. of Dependents	Formerly WIN Trainee this Organization (Yes or No)	Self-placed (Yes or No)	Hourly Wage when Hired	No. of Months Employed	Still Here (Yes or No)	Quit or Fired

22B. ASK IN REGARD TO EACH OF THOSE WHO HAVE LEFT: Do you happen to know where _____ went from here?

C. Does the supervisor of _____ supervise other WIN employees?

Yes (ASK D). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 24) 2

D. How many?

23. On the whole, how do your WIN workers compare to people you normally have working at these kinds of jobs?

	Same	Better	Worse	DK, NA
Need for supervision	1	2	3	4
Promptness and attendance	1	2	3	4
Performance	1	2	3	4

24A. Do you see any difference in social background between these WIN workers and the other people you usually hire for the same kinds of jobs?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 25) . . . 2

B. Please explain.

25. In general, when your WIN workers came here to work, how well would you say they were prepared as compared to other new workers in this job? Better prepared, about the same, or less well prepared?

Better prepared. 1

About the same 2

Less well prepared . . . 3

26A. Have any special jobs been created just for these employees?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 27) 2

B. Would you please describe the job(s)?

27. In some companies the hours of work, or the rules, or the job itself have been changed a little so that people with special problems can hold down the job? Do you think that's a good idea or not?

Yes. 1

No 2

28A. Has anything like that been done for these WIN employees?

Yes (ASK B). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 29) 2

B. Would you please tell me about that?

29A. Is there any kind of orientation session for new employees?

Yes (ASK B & C). 1

No (SKIP TO Q. 30) 2

B. Is this for all new employees or especially for disadvantaged workers or WIN workers?

All new employees. 1

Disadvantaged workers, including WIN. 2

WIN workers only 3

C. How much time does this involve altogether?

_____ hours

30. Has there been any special orientation for foremen or supervisors who supervise WIN workers or other disadvantaged workers?

Yes. 1

No 2

31. How about counseling--having someone other than one's supervisor to discuss either personal or job related problems? Is there someone especially assigned as a counselor?

Yes. 1

No 2

32. Some organizations have a "buddy system" where an older employee is assigned to a new one for a period of time to show him the ropes, make it easier for him to get adjusted, etc. Do you have such a system here?

Yes. 1

No 2

33. (IF APPROPRIATE): How much do supervisors have to say about hiring new people--as compared to the front office?

Front office has complete authority 1

Supervisor and front office share authority . . . 2

Supervisor has complete authority 3

34A. How often does a WIN representative or an Employment Service counselor check with you or with the supervisor on the WIN employees, either in person or by phone?

_____ times per _____ (ASK B)

Never (SKIP TO Q. 35) x

Don't know (SKIP TO Q. 35). . . . . y

B. How helpful do you feel this is? Would you say this is very helpful, somewhat helpful, doesn't make any difference one way or the other, or does it have some disadvantages?

Very helpful 1

Somewhat 2

No difference. 3

Harmful. 4

35. Do you have any feelings about hiring more people from the WIN program? For instance, if you had a vacancy, would you hire them in preference to other applicants, under no circumstances, or what?

Would hire in preference to other applicants if there were vacancies 1

Would hire, but not in preference to others 2

Would not hire even if there were vacancies 3

Not sure. 4

36. Does the supervisor of _____ (WIN WORKER) know about the WIN program and which of his workers came from the program?

Yes. 1

No 2

Not sure. 3

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPERVISORS

Name of Organization: _____

Unit Designation: _____

Name of Supervisor: _____

His participation in WIN training program: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Suggested Introduction

Hello. I am _____ from the Bureau of Social Science Research in Washington. We are doing a study for the U.S. Department of Labor on some job training programs conducted by the State Employment Service. We've taken a random sample of some people who were in one of these job training programs, and one of the names that came up happens to be in your department. (Her) (His) name is _____. I'd like to talk to you about him (her) but I also have a few other questions.

1. First of all, I'd like to ask you some questions about your unit (department). How long has it been in operation?

_____

2. How many employees are in your unit (department) not counting yourself (on this shift)?

_____

3. Would you tell me the different jobs and how many people are in each one?

ENTER ON CHART AND FILL OUT REMAINING COLUMNS. If more than 5 job categories, do not attempt to fill out chart but get summary information for unit (see instructions).

COMPOSTION OF DEPARTMENT

Job	No.	Salary Range		Sex		# Under 35	Race or Ethnic Group				Length of Time on Present Job		
		From	To	# M	# F		W	N	S	O	# Less Than 3 Mos.	# 3 Mos. to 2 Yrs.	# More Than 2 Yrs.
S.													
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													

4. Which job does _____ (WIN WORKER TO BE DISCUSSED) have? (PUT STAR BESIDE WIN WORKER JOB ON CHART.)

5. What are the hours (on this shift)?

From: _____ to _____

6. Are there other shifts?

From: _____ to _____

7A. IF MORE THAN ONE SHIFT: Do some people change shifts?

Yes. 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 8). 2

*B. IF YES TO A: Are they required to change, or do they have a choice?

Required to change 1

Choice 2

8A. Do workers here work overtime?

Yes. 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 9). 2

*B. IF YES TO A: Which jobs? _____

_____

*C. IF YES TO A: Is overtime work required or optional?

Required 1

Optional 2

9. How much time is allowed for lunch, coffee breaks and so on?

Lunch _____

Coffee breaks _____

Other (PLEASE SPECIFY): _____

_____

10. Aside from this, are the employees allowed to leave the area for a few minutes now and then without your permission;

for instance, to go to the restroom? Yes 1

No 2

or for anything else, for instance to have a cigarette? Yes 1

No 2

11. Is there a time clock?

Yes 1

No. 2

12. Is the work of the unit (department) held up if one person is late?

Yes 1

No. 2

13A. How many times during a month could a person be late for work before you'd want to dismiss (her) (him)?

Number of times _____ (SKIP TO Q. 14)

Depends _____*

*B. IF DEPENDS: What would it depend on?

14A. How many times a month could someone be absent before you'd want to dismiss him--if he had called in each time and had a good reason?

Number of times _____ (SKIP TO Q. 15)

Depends _____*

*B. IF DEPENDS: What would it depend on?

15A. And what if he didn't call in and didn't have good reasons--how many times could this happen (before you'd want to dismiss him)?

Number of times _____ (SKIP TO Q. 16)

Depends _____ *

*B. IF DEPENDS: What would that depend on?

16. In your opinion, what <u>should</u> be the main reasons for dismissing someone?

17. In some companies the hours of work, or the rules, or the job itself have been changed a little so that people with special problems other than physical handicaps can hold down the job. Do you think that's a good idea, or not?

Yes. 1

No 2

18A. Has anything like that been done here in your unit (department)?

Yes. 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 17) . . . 2

*B. IF YES TO A: Would you tell me about it?

19A. Another thing that some companies do is hire people who don't meet all of the usual qualifications for the job. Has that been done for anyone in your unit (department)?

Yes. 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 17) 2

*B. IF YES TO A: What qualifications have changed?

20. ASK ONLY IF ALREADY KNOWN THAT RESPONDENT HAS PARTICIPATED IN TRAINING WIN WORKERS. OTHERWISE, (SKIP TO Q. 21).

I understand that you have had some people in your unit who were referred for training or work experience by the WIN program, which is run by the Employment Service. What I am talking about are people who were only in your unit for training, not as regular employees (workers you had not actually hired).

1. How many trainees (were) (are) there? _____

2. Was _____ (one of these) (the one)?

3. What was your part in training them (him or her)?

_____

_____

4. What do you think about this training program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Here are some of the comments about these training programs which we have received from other employers. I would like to know if any of them apply to your unit. (HAND R CARD B.)

		Yes	No
a)	Some companies use the program mainly to train workers all of whom they plan to absorb in their company. Is this the case here?.	1	2
b)	Other companies say that what they like about the program is that it gives them a chance to test a group of prospective employees, i.e., gives a chance to look them over and hire the best. Do you do this?.	1	2
c)	Others think the advantage of the program is that it helps them fill manpower needs at no expense while at the same time these people are doing something useful or being trained for work elsewhere. Is it true in your case? .	1	2
d)	Still others like having an arrangement under which they have trained persons available when job openings occur; in other words, with the help of the program, you can hold people whom you want to take on but for whom you don't have an opening or money in the budget until a little later. Is this the case here?	1	2

Now I'd like to ask some questions about the _____ job itself.

21. Is this a permanent job or a temporary or seasonal job, or does that vary?

Permanent 1

Temporary 2

Séasonal. 3

Varies. 4

22. IF PRIVATE AGENCY OR BUSINESS, (SKIP TO Q. 23).

IF GOVERNMENT AGENCY--INCLUDING STATE OR LOCAL, ASK:

Is this a civil service job?

Yes. 1

No 2

23. What are the duties in this job?

24. Which of these qualifications do you have to have for this job? (HAND R CARD C.)

		Yes	No
a.	High school diploma or equivalent	1	2
b.	No police record.	1	2
c.	Ability to read	1	2
d.	Ability to write.	1	2
e.	Good personal appearance.	1	2
f.	Previous experience in this particular work . . .	1	2
g.	Previous job experience of any kind	1	2
h.	Job references.	1	2
i.	Pass a test	1	2

A. Can you think of anything else?

25. How many people have held this job in the last 12 months, that is the _____ job(s) we are talking about?

_____

26A. REFER BACK TO CHART, PAGE 2, FOR JOBS IN DEPARTMENT:

Can an employee in this job be promoted to a higher paying job in this unit?

Yes 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 27). 2

*B. IF YES TO A: Which jobs? _____

_____

_____

*C. IF YES TO A: How many times has this happened in the last 12 months?

_____

27A. Can someone in this job be promoted to a higher paying job (better job) somewhere else in the organization (outside this unit)?

Yes. 1*

No 2

*B. IF YES TO A: What kind of jobs? _____

_____

*C. IF YES TO A: How many times has this happened in the last 12 months?

_____

Now I'd like to ask some questions about _____ (WIN WORKER).

28. IF Q. 20 NOT ASKED:

First of all, did you know before I mentioned it that (she) (he) came from an Employment Service work-training program?

Yes. 1

No 2

29. SEE QUESTION 21:

What is _____'s (WIN WORKER'S) status: permanent, temporary, or seasonal?

Permanent 1

Temporary 2

Seasonal. 3

30. IF PRIVATE AGENCY OR BUSINESS, SKIP TO Q. 31.

IF GOVERNMENT AGENCY--INCLUDING STATE OR LOCAL, AND IF JOB IS CIVIL SERVICE (SEE Q. 22), ASK:

What grade level is _____ (WIN WORKER)?

31A. What was (her) (his) starting hourly pay rate? _____

What is (her) (his) current hourly pay rate? _____*

*B. IF HIGHER THAN STARTING RATE: Was this periodic pay increase which all employees get or a merit raise?

Periodic pay increase. . . . 1

Merit raise. 2

32A. How does (she) (he) get along with other people in your unit--would you say better than most, just about average, or below average?

Better (SKIP TO Q. 29) 1

Average (SKIP TO Q. 29). . . . 2

Below. 3*

*B. Can you tell me a little more about that?

PROBES

1. What have you done?

2. Would you do that with anyone or have you made a special effort in this case?

33. When _____ came to work here (was actually hired), was (she) (he) about as well prepared as most new people on this job, less well prepared, or better prepared?

As well prepared 1

Less well prepared 2

Better prepared. 3

34. How would you describe (her) (his) general attitude toward the job?

PROBES

1. Does (she) (he) like it?
2. Is (she) (he) motivated?
3. Does (she) (he) want to stay here?

35A. Does _____ need more supervision than most other people in your (unit) (department), less supervision, or about the same amount as others?

More 1*

Same (SKIP TO Q. 6). 2

Less (SKIP TO Q. 6). 3

*B. IF MORE: Why is that?

*C. IF MORE: How do you feel about taking the extra time and trouble?

PROBES

1. How much extra time does it take?
2. Is it worth it?

36A. How would you rate (her) (his) performance on the job considering how long (she) (he) has been on the job? Would you say it is better than average, just about average, or below average?

Better 1*

Average (SKIP TO Q. 7) . . . 2

Below. 3**

*B. IF BETTER OR BELOW: Why is that?

**C. IF BELOW: What have you done about it?

PROBES

1. Did you make a special effort?

2. Has there been any improvement?

37A. How would you rate (her) (his) attendance compared to the other employees in your (unit) (department)--would you say it has been better than average, just about average, or below average?

Better (SKIP TO Q. 8). . . . 1

Average (SKIP TO Q. 8) . . . 2

Below. 3*

*B. IF BELOW: What has been the trouble?

PROBES

1. What have you done about it?

2. Has it improved or not?

3. Is that the way you <u>usually</u> handle this?

38A. How would you rate (her) (him) on getting to work on time compared to the other employees--would you say (she) (he) has been better than average, just about average, or below average?

Better (SKIP TO Q. 9). . . . 1

Average (SKIP TO Q. 9) . . . 2

Below. 3*

*B. IF BELOW: Why is that? Why has (she) (he) been late?

PROBES

1. What have you done about it?

2. Has (she) (he) improved?

3. Do you <u>usually</u> handle it this way? (for other people).

39A. Here are some (other) kinds of problems people have told us employees have. As I read each one, tell me if _____ has been bothered by it. (RECORD BELOW UNDER "NO" OR "YES".)

	Q. 35		Q. 35A		
	No	Yes	Great Deal	Some	Not At All
a. Child care	1	2	3	4	5
b. Transportation	1	2	3	4	5
c. Domestic problems	1	2	3	4	5
d. Drinking	1	2	3	4	5
e. Chronic personal illness	1	2	3	4	5
f. Trouble with the the law	1	2	3	4	5
g. Drugs	1	2	3	4	5
h. Chronic illness in the family	1	2	3	4	5
i. Garnishment	1	2	3	4	5
j. Language problems	1	2	3	4	5
k. Can you think of anything else. (specify):_____ _____	1	2	3	4	5

B. (IF ONE OR MORE YES ANSWERS TO Q. 35): Would you say this has interfered with (her) (his) work a great deal, some or not at all? (RECORD ABOVE.)

IF NO "GREAT DEAL" ANSWER, (SKIP TO Q. 36).

IF MORE THAN ONE "GREAT DEAL" ANSWER, ask questions C & D.

IF ONE "GREAT DEAL" ANSWER, ask question D only.

C. (IF MORE THAN ONE "GREAT DEAL" IN Q. 35A ASK FOLLOWING QUESTION OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 35C): You mentioned that _____ (NAME PROBLEMS) has (have) interfered with (her) (his) work a great deal . Which of these would you say has interfered the most?

D. Tell me how it has been a problem.

PROBES

1. Has this been getting better or worse?

2. What have you done about it?

3. Is that the way you usually handle this with your employees?

40. What would be your guess about what is going to happen to _____ _____ within the next six months or so?

(POSSIBLE ANSWERS--DO NOT READ)

He is likely to stay 1

To be fired. 2

To be promoted 3

To leave of his own accord . 4

41A. Has anyone from the Employment Service been in touch with you about _____?

Yes. 1*

No (SKIP TO Q. 33) 2

*B. About how often have they contacted you?

_____ per _____

*C. How do you feel about that?

42. What are the main advantages in hiring people like _____?

43. What are the main disadvantages of hiring people like _____?

44. ENTER THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ON BASIS OF OBSERVATION:

Race or nationality of supervisor: _____

Approximate age: _____

☐ Male ☐ Female